

From: MARCIA LAGERLOEF
To: R10HUB.in."spencer. hovekamp@noaa.gov"
Date: 7/8/97 1:28pm
Subject: Review of Washington water quality standards revisions

Washington's Department of Ecology has proposed water quality standards revisions out at public notice now, with a closing date of July 18. The package is a mixed bag: lake phosphorus criteria; revisions to the marine copper and cyanide criteria; revisions to the ammonia criteria; changes in how they allow exceedances of standards for dredging, application of aquatic pesticides, and spills at dams (TDG exceedances); and addition of "wetlands" to their definition of waters of the state, as well as some specifics on how to protect wetlands. NOW is when NOAA and EPA can most effectively affect what the state ultimately adopts, by commenting on the proposals. I agreed in Boise I would give Service staff a heads-up at times like this, rather than asking them to track every bit of the development of standards. I think your folks should look at the copper and cyanide changes as well as the provision for standards exceedances, however I can't locate who the key individual would be. I've talked to Matt Longinbaugh (sp?) in Olympia, who tells me he's got all his time committed on HCPs and Phil Roni at the Montlake lab (who is on Washington's technical committee for changes to their water classification for fish). Matt referred me to Steve Morris, so I left him a message over a week ago, with no response. Phil sent an email to Elizabeth Garr asking who should have the lead on this and giving her my name and number. I haven't heard from her either. Can you help out? I simply need a person identified who will be my lead NMFS contact for the Washington wqs review. After the state completes the current revisions (Phase 1), which they hope to adopt in September, they will go to public workshops in the winter with the more complex pieces (Phase 2), which include antidegradation implementation procedures and a new system for classifying their waters, including more protective temperature criteria for salmonids. In other words, there will be some ongoing action now on Washington wqs over the next year. I've been trying hard with this state to get ahead of the curve and identify the ESA concerns BEFORE the wqs are adopted, so that we won't have to disapprove (which is turning into a messy process in Idaho). All I want at this point is an indication of whether NMFS sees any showstoppers in what Washington is proposing in Phase 1. Thanks for any help you can give in sorting out the contact. I'll be glad to work with whomever it is to walk them through the changes.

CC: R10HUB.in."proni@sci.nwfsc.noaa.gov", R10IOO.IOO.M...